

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18, 20-26, 28, 30-32, and 34-39 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 40-43 have been added, which are supported by *at least* paragraphs [45], [60]-[63], [80], and [81] of the Specification.

Accordingly, claims 40-43 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-16, 18, 20-26, 28, 30-32, 34-36, 38, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson (U.S. Patent No. 6,957,075) in view of Zanchi (U.S. Patent No. 5,814,798). Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson in view of Zanchi, and further in view of Nakajima (U.S. Patent No. 7,095,456). Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Iverson in view of Zanchi, and further in view of Miller *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0046557, hereinafter “Miller”).

Applicants do not acquiesce to these rejections. Since these claims have been canceled, however, the rejections thereto are rendered moot.

New Claims

New claims 40-44 are patentable because the prior art of record *at least* does not teach selecting all the determined input/output module identification information relevant to the received user based identification information among the plurality of the stored input/output module identification information, identifying relative priority level of a plurality of the selected input/output module identification information, determining whether input/output modules

corresponding to the selected input/output module identification information are available based on the identified priority level, and executing the determined available input/output module with the highest priority level among all available input/output modules, as set forth in some variation in independent claims 40 and 42.

For example, in claims 40 and 42, the determined available input/output module with the highest priority level among all available input/output modules is executed. In other words, a plurality of input/output modules are available for selection, and a particular input/output module is selected based on priority. On the other hand, a plurality of preferences are not available for selection in Zanchi. In fact, the Examiner acknowledges that default or predicted preferences are assigned to an application device when the “preferences are unavailable or unacceptable”, (Zanchi, col. 8, lines 28-52, and col. 10, lines 48-51, and Office Action dated January 15, 2010, page 36, second full paragraph, emphasis added). Therefore, Zanchi does not teach *at least* the feature of “executing the determined available input/output module with the highest priority level among all available input/output modules”. Iverson also does not cure the deficient teachings of Zanchi in this regard.

Accordingly, claims 40 and 42 are patentable over the combined teachings of Zanchi and Iverson.

Claims 41 and 43 are patentable *at least* by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/824,434

Attorney Docket No.: Q80016

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ S. Stuart Lee /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

S. Stuart Lee
Registration No. 61,124

Date: April 15, 2010